

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-48 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1-2, 8-9, 13-14, 20-21, 25-26, 32-33, 37-38 and 44-45. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are none. New claims added herein are none.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on January 15, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Schofield. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] I understood the Examiner to agree that independent all of the claims would be allowable over the cited art if amended as discussed during the interview.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1-2, 8-9, 13-14, 20-21, 25-26, 32-33, 37-38 and 44-45 herein.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0012] Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0013] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following reference:

- **Schofield**: *Schofield, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,222,447 (issued Apr. 24, 2001).

Overview of the Application

[0014] The Application describes a technology for selecting a video source view from at least one of a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources based on detection of a vehicle event. The video source view is displayed according to a presentation mode, whereby the presentation rules are editable and configurable (*Application*, Abstract). Default mode(s) of the system are user-definable. Thus, the user can define what is displayed when no signal is asserted. For example, the default mode can be set to a full-sized rear view and two small windows for left and right cameras. For a system with four cameras, this means that the default mode for left and right cameras are 'Window', the default mode for rear view is 'Full' and the default for front camera is 'Off' (*Application*, page 13, lines 7-13).

Cited References

[0015] The Examiner cites Schofield as the primary reference in the anticipation rejections.

Schofield

[0016] Schofield describes a technology for a rearview vision system for a vehicle that includes an image capture device mounted at the rear of the vehicle and having a field of view directed rearwardly of the vehicle. A display system is viewable by a driver of the vehicle. The display system displays a rearward image output of the image capture device. A graphic overlay is superimposed on the rearward image when the gear actuator of the vehicle selects a reverse gear. The graphic overlay may include indicia of the anticipated path of travel of the vehicle. The graphic overlay may be disabled when the gear actuator of the vehicle is not in reverse gear (*Schofield*, Abstract).

Anticipation Rejections

[0017] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

Based upon Schofield

[0018] The Examiner rejects claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schofield. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0019] Amended independent claim 1 recites a method comprising [emphasis added]:

selecting multiple video source views from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources based on detection of a vehicle event;

displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the **displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the**

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views.

[0020] In the rejection to this claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by Schofield. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim.

[0021] For example, Schofield fails to disclose or describe "displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the *displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views*".

[0022] Instead, Schofield identifies that a display is provided for images captured by the image capture devices. The display combines the captured images into an image that would be achieved by a single rearward-looking camera having a view unobstructed by the vehicle (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 30-34). The displayed image includes an image portion from each of the image capture devices. The image portion from the center image capture device is vertically compressed (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 54-57). The compression of the central image portion produces a dead space in the displayed image which may be made to correspond with the area that would be occupied by the vehicle in the view from the single virtual camera (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 66-67 and column 3, lines 1-2). However, Schofield does not disclose or describe where "the displaying comprises a full screen display of one of the multiple video source views, and a *window within the full screen display containing another of the multiple video*

source views". As described above, Schofield creates a "composite" rearview display incorporating multiple vehicle mounted cameras.

[0023] Based on the discussion above, as well as decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Schofield does not anticipate all of the elements of this claim, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

Independent Claim 13

[0024] Amended independent claim 13 recites a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a computer process comprising [emphasis added]:

selecting multiple video source views from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources based on detection of a vehicle event;

displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the **displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views.**

[0025] In the rejection to this claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by Schofield. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim.

[0026] For example, Schofield fails to disclose or describe "displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the *displaying comprises a*

full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views".

[0027] Instead, as discussed for claim 1 above, Schofield identifies that a display is provided for images captured by the image capture devices. The display combines the captured images into an image that would be achieved by a single rearward-looking camera having a view unobstructed by the vehicle (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 30-34). However, Schofield does not disclose or describe where "the *displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views*". As described above, Schofield creates a "composite" rearview display incorporating multiple vehicle mounted cameras.

[0028] Based on the discussion above, as well as decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Schofield does not anticipate all of the elements of this claim, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

Independent Claim 25

[0029] Amended independent claim 25 recites a system comprising [emphasis added]:

display logic selecting multiple video source views from a plurality of vehicle-mounted video sources based on detection of a vehicle event;

a display device for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the **displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a**

window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views.

[0030] In the rejection to this claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by Schofield. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim.

[0031] For example, Schofield fails to disclose or describe “a display device for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views”.

[0032] Instead, as discussed for claim 1 above, Schofield identifies that a display is provided for images captured by the image capture devices. The display combines the captured images into an image that would be achieved by a single rearward-looking camera having a view unobstructed by the vehicle (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 30-34). However, Schofield does not disclose or describe where “displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views”. As described above, Schofield creates a “composite” rearview display incorporating multiple vehicle mounted cameras.

[0033] Based on the discussion above, as well as decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Schofield does not

anticipate all of the elements of this claim, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

Independent Claim 37

[0034] Amended independent claim 37 recites a vehicle comprising [emphasis added]:

 a computer having display logic selecting multiple video source views from a plurality of video sources mounted on the vehicle based on detection of a vehicle event;

 a display device communicating with the computer for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the **displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views.**

[0035] In the rejection to this claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by Schofield. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim.

[0036] For example, Schofield fails to disclose or describe "a display device communicating with the computer for displaying the multiple video source views simultaneously, wherein the *displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views*".

[0037] Instead, as discussed for claim 1 above, Schofield identifies that a display is provided for images captured by the image capture devices. The display combines the captured images into an image that would be achieved by a single rearward-looking camera having a view unobstructed by the vehicle (*Schofield*, column 2, lines 30-34). However, Schofield does not disclose or describe where “displaying comprises a full view mode of one of the multiple video source views, and a window within the full view mode containing another of the multiple video source views”. As described above, Schofield creates a “composite” rearview display incorporating multiple vehicle mounted cameras.

[0038] Based on the discussion above, as well as decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Schofield does not anticipate all of the elements of this claim, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

Dependent Claims

[0039] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0040] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 1-15-2008

By: E John Fain

E. John Fain
Reg. No. 60960
(509) 324-9256 x256
johnf@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com